

4/26/92

Joe, dear friend of my youth and octogenarian one-man peace corps, has just ~~4/26/92~~ returned from one of his frequent trips to Israel where, being one of the developers of nylon, he replaces experts in the Israeli nylon plant so they can meet their military obligations without interfering with nylon production. Their military obligations continue until they are 50, I think.

Joe saves the Jerusalem Post's he gets and reads there and on his return sends them to me. I read them and pass them on to Hood College professors who have area interests. From the time of the 'ulf war if not as I believe earlier in the Bush administration I perceived and commented on middle east policy that Bush was changing and continues to change. It began well before the dissolution of the USSR so the ending of the US policy of using Israel against the USSR interests it perceived does not really account for this changed policy, now rather apparent.

The Bush/Baker policy is anti-Israel although pretendedly it isn't. It is overtly pro-Arab. In itself this can be interpreted as anti-Israel given the fact that save for Egypt the entire Muslim world remains in a state of war with Israel. What underlies Bush's pro-Arab policy tilt can only be conjectured. An obvious conjecture is Bush's oil interests and associations. It may have more and other causes.

That Bush could cotton up to Syria's bloody tyrant, given his murderous record and even suspicions that he is responsible for the murders of many Americans, and do this openly, reflects his determination to be pro-Arab even if ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> holds domestic costs for him, as with decent media attention, it would,

Israel, regardless of who controls its government, has the need to get along with the US government, an urgent need. Although inevitably the Israeli government was aware of the new direction of US middle-east policy before others could have been, it did not dare articulate it and it didn't. But the more anti-Israel Bush grew the more pointed Israel's comments became.

The anti-Israel policy is interpreted by our media as an anti-Shamir policy. It would have to be anti- any other head of the Israeli government because no Israeli government could survive with policies radically different from Shamir's vis-a-vis the Arabs and the head of the other major party has already affirmed this publicly.

Israel's understanding that Bush has changed traditional US policy toward it is reported and discussed in the issues of The Jerusalem Post I've just gone over. Because I could not clip the papers and pass them on I've copied a few article, some not in full, and attach them.

Because I thought they might be of interest I've also copied an ad for a recall that took up almost a quarter of a front page and a spoof. Compare what the ad says with what happens here when manufacturers learn they have a faulty product. The spoof ~~is~~ <sup>of them</sup> from an entire oped page, headed "(Not Necessarily) The Jerusalem Post."

I believe this is a politically independent paper, and a very good one.

HW 4/26/92